

F-8188

Identifier: Nobutomo TANAKA, et al.

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending and Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for determining that claims 4-10 contain allowable subject matter, where claims 4-5 would be allowed if rewritten to include the limitations of the claims from which they depend and claims 6-10 would be allowed if rewritten to overcome rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended Claim 4 to include the limitations of Claim 1, amended claims 2-3 to depend from either of claims 1 or 4, and amended claims 6-10 to overcome the rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 4 and 6-10 are patentable, claims 2-3 as they depend from Claim 4 are patentable, and Claim 5 depending from Claim 4 is patentable.

Claim 1 and claims 2-3 as they depend from Claim 1 have each been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura (USPN 6824276) as modified by Stanton (USPN 5917558). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

The Examiner asserts that "sensor means" as recited in Claim 1 is illustrated in Kimura at Fig. 1, with elements 22 and 70. However, Claim 1 specifically recites that the sensor is used "for detecting a color temperature of the light for projection". Kimura, on the other hand, illustrates that element 22 is a "specific information input module" and the reference further discloses at

F-8188

Identifier: Nobutomo TANAKA, et al.

col. 6, lns. 6 to 18, that element 70 is an information module for detecting a filter attachment. The reference fails to teach that either of these elements is a sensor or module for detecting color temperature. Stanton also fails to teach such a sensor.

As the references fail to teach the claimed recitations, Claim 1 and claims 2-3 as depending from Claim 1 are patentable. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974) (a prima face case of obviousness is established only where the combination of cited references teaches or suggests each limitation in the claim).

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

F-8188

Identifier: Nobutomo TANAKA, et al.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan / D. H. 48770
Frank J. Jordan
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340